At the outset of the Liberal leadership race, I was eager to start pushing out regular coverage of the happenings of the race; after all, this is the first federal leadership election since Pierre Poilievre's coronation over two years ago.

With over half a dozen potential candidates, the march towards choosing Trudeau's successor seemed, at least to me, an intriguing exercise that could potentially highlight the power of different factions within the

Liberal Party and, more broadly, left-of-centre Canadian politics writ large.

Instead, what has happened is a coagulation of the race around two (one has yet to announce, although she is presumed to do so sometime soon) anglophone, globalist, technocratic elites.

The similarities between the two of them has been patently obvious to me for a long time, and I noted their striking resemblance in the post I published just hours after Trudeau's resignation:

> The other major flaw with Carney is the striking parallels between his life and Freeland's. Both of them grew up in Edmonton, both of them attended Harvard and Oxford, both of them lived in London and New York at various times in their lives, both them are members of the World Economic Forum….the list goes on.

Indeed, it is difficult to find anything meaningful to voters that differentiates the two of them (besides genitalia).

Thanks for reading! Subscribe for free to receive new posts and support my work.

During his appearance on the Daily Show, Carney tried to position himself as an "outsider" untouched by the slimy machinations of the Liberal Party machine - yet any sentient being who has read Carney's résumé would know that to be complete and utter bullshit.

Carney, in fact, may as well be the poster child for the word "insider" - just take a look at his biography on the World Economic Forum's website:

> Mark is also Chair at Brookfield Asset Management.
> 1988, Bachelor's in Economics, Harvard University; 1993, Master's in Economics and 1995, Doctorate in Economics, Oxford University.
> Thirteen years with Goldman Sachs in London, Tokyo, New York, Toronto. 2003-04, Deputy Governor, Bank of Canada. 2004-08, Senior Associate Deputy Minister of Finance. 2008-13, Governor of the Bank of Canada. Since July 2013, Governor of the Bank of England.
> Chairman, Financial Stability Board (FSB); He is also an external

> member of the Board of Stripe, a member of the Global Advisory Board of PIMCO, Harvard University, Rideau Hall Foundation, Bilderberg, the boards of Bloomberg Philanthropies, the Peterson Institute for International Economics the Hoffman Institute for Global Business and Society at INSEAD, Cultivo, as well as Senior Counsellor of the MacroAdvisory Partners, Advisor of the Watershed, and Chair of Chatham House, the Group of Thirty and also Advisory Board Chair for Canada 2020.

Freeland's WEF profile, meanwhile, is equally dense with degrees from elite universities, important-sounding positions, and complimentary adjectives:

> An esteemed journalist and author, the Deputy Prime Minister was born in Peace River, Alberta. She was educated at Harvard University before continuing her studies on a Rhodes Scholarship at the University of Oxford.
>
> After launching her career in journalism as a Ukraine-based freelance

correspondent for the Financial Times, The Washington Post, and The Economist, Ms. Freeland went on to various roles at the Financial Times of London. She then served as deputy editor of the Toronto-based Globe and Mail between 1999 and 2001, before returning to the Financial Times as deputy editor and then as United States managing editor.

In 2010, she joined Canadian-owned Thomson Reuters. She was a managing director of the company and editor of consumer news when she decided to return home and enter politics in 2013.

Ms. Freeland has written two books: Sale of the Century: The Inside Story of the Second Russian Revolution (2000); and Plutocrats: The Rise of the New Global Super-Rich and the Fall of Everyone Else (2012). Plutocrats has been an international best-seller and won the Lionel Gelber Prize and National Business Book Award.

In 2018, the Deputy Prime Minister was recognized as Foreign Policy's

> Diplomat of the Year. She was also awarded the Eric M. Warburg Award by Atlantik-Brücke, for her achievements in strengthening transatlantic ties. In 2020, she was awarded Freedom House's Mark Palmer Prize, in recognition of her years of work in championing democracy and human rights.
>
> She is a member of the Forum's Board of Trustees

Because of the abundance of credentials both Carney and Freeland possess, it could be presumed that both of them would also possess an abundance of original ideas on deep questions relating to how we live and govern ourselves. Right?

Wrong.

So far, the elitist duo have shied away from most matters of substance and depth.

A few years ago, Mark Carney published a book with the bland and unsuggestive title of *Value(s).* As you would suspect, it is, essentially, an application of liberal platitudes to economics. As *National Review* put it:

> It is revealing to compare the values Carney claims are necessary to repurpose our economic and financial systems with those that the Nobel prize–winning economist Edmund Phelps shows are key to innovation and economic growth. Carney lists fairness, solidarity, resilience, responsibility, sustainability, humility, and dynamism. Phelps emphasizes independence, initiative, achievement, and acceptance of competition. Carney's values are arbitrary and politically motivated, while Phelps's are validated by both the historical evolution of innovation and statistical evidence. Carney's shallow analysis hardly justifies his cover flap's boast that he is "one of the great economic thinkers of our time."

Nothing suggests that Carney has tried to come up with anything more novel as of recent; his campaign website, for example, functions as a glorified resume.

For Freeland, even if she does possess such ideas, it will be hard for her to differentiate herself from the Trudeau's ideology considering she spent many long years as his most loyal acolyte and loudest cheerleader.

In Matthew 4:4, Jesus said that "man shall not live on bread alone".

On a similar note, it is worth saying that politicians shall not live on credentials alone.

Both Freeland and Carney have more-than-sufficient qualifications to be Prime Minister - yet scratch below the surface and you will find an emptiness to their ambition.

Both have spent years climbing up corporate and professional-managerial ladders and padding their resumes - for them, being Prime Minister is akin to "putting a feather in one's cap", as the saying goes.

Throughout the coming campaign, one can expect each of them to highlight the supposed differences between each other - an exercise that

can be summed up using the phrase “the narcissism of small differences”.

Yet, fundamentally, they are the same.

Both of them are technocratic liberals.

Both of them are ambitious strivers and credentialists.

Both of them suffer from a poverty of ideas all-too-common among the upper echelons of polite society.

And both of them, if either one ends up winning the leadership, will not stand a chance against Pierre Poilievre in the next election.